AUG 0 3 2011 W

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: Bharadwaj

S.NO. 09/863,425	ART UNIT: 2141
FILED: MAY 22, 2001	EXAMINER: KENNETH COULTER
TITLE: REMOTE DISPLAYS IN MOBILE COMMUNICATION NETWORKS	DOCKET NO: BHARADWAJ-001

RESPONSE TO FIRST OFFICE ACTION DATED APRIL 18, 2011

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir.

This is in response to the Office Action dated 4/18/2011, in which a Request for Continued Examination was examined and all pending claims are rejected over a set of references under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Based on the discussions and taking into account your input, I am enclosing proposed amendments that better match the results of the conversation. The changes from our previous filing are underlined.

REMARKS

This is a response to the office action of April 18, 2011. It is a resubmission of the office action mailed in early July with format corrections as per USPTO.

All pending claims were rejected over Kikinis (USP 6,076,109). Applicant believes and therefore argues that Kikinis is not a pertinent reference for the reasons below.

Kikinis is Inapplicable

Independent Claims 38 & 41 are rewritten as presented in April 2011 to recite an aspect of the invention that includes reestablishment of a prior session with the server. See, e.g., claim 38, which recites, in relevant part: if the client computer has a prior session with the server computer, then, obtaining information regarding the prior session, obtaining information on how to connect to the prior session, and reestablishing the prior session;

Likewise, Claim 41 recites, in relevant part:

if the remote client device is disconnected, accepting a reconnection request from the remote client device, sending to the client device information regarding a prior session, if any, and restoring a prior session with the remote client device, wherein the display state of the client device is restored after reconnection.

Jim